

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 3, 2007. Claims 1-42 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 13-32 and 37-40, and rejected claims 1-12, 33, 35, 36 and 41-42. The present response amends claims 1-13, 23, 33, 35-36, and 41-42. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I. Claim Objection

In the Office Action mailed July 3, 2007, the Examiner objects to claim 23 and required correction. Here, claim 23 is amended accordingly based on the Examiner's opinion.

In addition, claims 1, 13 and 23 are also amended based on the Examiner's opinion.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

In the Office Action mailed July 3, 2007, the Examiner rejects claims 1-12, 33 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner further states that claim 1 recites a computer-implemented system; however, the computer implemented system [is] never disclosed in the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that, in Paragraph [0021], Line 1-5, the present application discloses that “[o]ne embodiment may be implemented using a conventional general purpose or specialized digital computer or microprocessor(s) programmed according to the teaching of the present disclosure.” Therefore, independent claim 1, as currently amended, states as “[a] system implemented using a computer” is supported by the disclosure in the specification of the present application. Hence, claim 1 should satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. §101 and be in allowable condition as currently amended. Furthermore, since claims 2-12 and 35-36 are

dependent on allowable independent claim 1, claims 2-12 and 35-36 should all be in allowable condition.

In addition, for the same reason as stated above, independent claim 33 should satisfy the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. §101 and be in allowable condition as currently amended. Correspondently, dependent claims 41 and 42 which are based on allowable independent claim 33 should also be in allowable condition.

III. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09-28-2007

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910